

**Amendment and Response under 37 C.F.R. 1.116**

Applicant: Francisco Corella

Serial No.: 09/483,185

Filed: January 14, 2000

Docket No.: 10991054-1

Title: AUTHORIZATION INFRASTRUCTURE BASED ON PUBLIC KEY CRYPTOGRAPHY**REMARKS**

The following remarks are made in response to the Final Office Action mailed November 15, 2005. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-13, 15, 16, and 18-24 were rejected. With this Response, claims 1 and 13 have been amended. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-13, 15, 16, and 18-24 remain pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for being unpatentable over the Chapman U.S. Patent No. 6,058,484, in view of the Riggins U.S. Patent No. 6,233,341 in view of the Asay et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,903,882.

The Examiner rejected claims 7, 9, 19, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Chapman et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,058,484 in view of the Riggins U.S. Patent No. 6,233,341 in view of the Asay et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,903,882 in view of the Howell U.S. Patent No. 5,276,901.

The Examiner rejected claims 11 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Chapman et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,058,484 in view of the Riggins U.S. Patent No. 6,233,341 in view of the Asay et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,903,882 in view of the Maruyama U.S. Patent No. 6,393,563.

The Examiner rejected claims 12 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Chapman et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,058,484 in view of the Riggins U.S. Patent No. 6,233,341 in view of the Asay et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,903,882 in view of the Kausik U.S. Patent No. 6,263,446.

The Examiner admits that the Chapman et al. patent does not disclose a short-term public key certificate. The Examiner relies on the Riggins patent which teaches temporary certificates. Nevertheless, the Examiner does not cite a reference for a directory for storing short-term authorization information related to the user as recited in amended independent claim 1. The Riggins patent does not teach or suggest a directory for short-term authorization information related to the user, and thus also does not teach a short-term certificate binding the public key of the user to long-term identification information related to the user from the

**Amendment and Response under 37 C.F.R. 1.116**

Applicant: Francisco Corella

Serial No.: 09/483,185

Filed: January 14, 2000

Docket No.: 10991054-1

Title: AUTHORIZATION INFRASTRUCTURE BASED ON PUBLIC KEY CRYPTOGRAPHY

long-term certificate and to the short-term authorization information related to the user from the directory as recited in amended independent claim 1.

The Examiner refers to short-term authorization information as validity information, name, serial number as recited in column 15, lines 13-35 of the Riggins patent. This information referred to by the Examiner is contained in temporary certificate 400 illustrated in Figure 4A of the Riggins patent, which includes a subject name 410, a validity period 415, and a serial number 420. Amended independent claims 1 and 13 specifically recite that the short-term certificate includes meta-data related to the short-term certificate and an expiration date/time in addition to the long-term identification information related to the user from the long-term certificate and the short-term authorization information related to the user. The validity period 415 in temporary certificate 400 is equated to the expiration date/time recited in amended independent claims 1 and 13. The serial number 420 in temporary certificate 400 is related to temporary certificate 400 rather than the subject and is thus equated to meta-data related to the short-term certificate as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 13. The subject name 410 in temporary certificate 400 is long-term identification information related to the subject, because the subject's name does not typically change. Thus, the subject name 410, the validity period 415, and the serial number 420 disclosed in the Riggins patent and referenced by the Examiner are not short-term authorization information related to the user as recited in independent claims 1 and 13.

The Examiner is referred to page 12 of the present specification which lists, the user's name, the user's social security number, or the user's employee number as examples of long-term identification information related to the user. Page 12 of the present specification also provides, the following examples of short-term authorization information related to the user: expense authorization limit for an enterprise application; co-payment amount for an insurance application; disk storage quota for an IT application; or user ID plus group ID for Unix access application. Also, at page 12, the present specification discloses an example embodiment of meta-data field 72 which contains information about short-term certificate 70 rather than the user of the short-term certificate 70.

In view of the above, the Riggins patent does not teach or suggest storing short-term authorization information related to the user as recited in independent claims 1 and 13.

**Amendment and Response under 37 C.F.R. 1.116**

Applicant: Francisco Corella

Serial No.: 09/483,185

Filed: January 14, 2000

Docket No.: 10991054-1

Title: AUTHORIZATION INFRASTRUCTURE BASED ON PUBLIC KEY CRYPTOGRAPHY

Moreover, as to independent claims 1 and 13, the Examiner states that the Asay et al. patent "discloses that a certificate that becomes invalid by age need not be on the schedule CRL, because the age has already rendered the short-term certificate invalid, (Col 3, lines 1-4)." However, the Asay et al. patent does not teach short-term certificates. Therefore, the Asay et al. patent cannot teach the limitations of amended independent claims 1 and 13 of a short-term certificate not subject to revocation prior to the expiration date/time included in the short-term certificate.

Moreover, the Asay et al. patent does not teach or suggest any certificates which are "not subject to revocation prior to the expiration date/time" as required by the limitations of amended independent claims 1 and 13. Instead, the Asay et al. specifically states at column 3, lines 1-4 that "certificates which become invalid by virtue of their age need not be listed in a CRL because each certificate contains its own expiration date." This passage in the Asay et al. specifically refers to that if a certificate has become invalid because of its age expiration, there is then no longer a need for a listing in a CRL, but if the certificate has not yet become invalid by virtue of its age, it would then be listed in a CRL. Thus, the Asay et al. patent does not teach or suggest a short-term certificate that is not subject to revocation prior to the expiration date/time as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 13.

Furthermore, there is no teaching or suggestion to combine any teaching of the Asay et al. patent with the Riggins patent. In fact, Riggins teaches away from a short-term certificate that is not subject to revocation prior to the expiration date/time. For example in the Abstract, the Riggins patent specifically states that "[t]he web server engine maintains a revocation list that contains information identifying revoked temporary certificates, so that a revoked but thus far unexpired certificate can not be improperly used. The web site reviews the temporary certificate for authenticity and contacts the global server site to review the revocation list and determine whether the temporary certificate has been revoked."

There is also no reasonable expectation of success for this suggested combination as stated in the Riggins patent at column 3, lines 17-19 "[t]emporary certificates can safely be installed because they expire quickly and can be revoked when the user leaves the remote site." and as stated at column 14, lines 46-48 "the secure communications engine 147 determines if the temporary certificate 400 has expired or whether the user has logged out." Thus, in the Riggins system that uses a temporary certificate at a remote site, the system

**Amendment and Response under 37 C.F.R. 1.116**

Applicant: Francisco Corella

Serial No.: 09/483,185

Filed: January 14, 2000

Docket No.: 10991054-1

Title: AUTHORIZATION INFRASTRUCTURE BASED ON PUBLIC KEY CRYPTOGRAPHY

requires that when the user logs out of the remote site that the temporary certificate is revoked. Thus, there would be no reasonable expectation success if such capabilities would be removed from the Riggins system.

In view of the above, the combination of the Chapman et al. patent, the Riggins patent, and the Asay et al. patent does not establish any of the three basic criteria of a *prima facie* case of obviousness (See MPEP 2143) toward amended independent claims 1 and 13.

Dependent claims 3, 4, and 6-12 are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim (claim 1) and are allowable on further independent grounds in view of the novel and nonobvious features and combinations set forth therein. Dependent claims 15, 16, and 18-24 are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim (claim 13) and are allowable on further independent grounds in view of the novel and nonobvious features and combinations set forth therein.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the above rejections and respectfully requests allowance of all pending claims 1, 3, 4, 6-13, 15, 16, and 18-24.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1, 3, 4, 6-13, 15, 16, and 18-24 are in form for allowance and are not taught or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1, 3, 4, 6-13, 15, 16, and 18-24 is respectfully requested.

No fees are required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16(h)(i). However, if such fees are required, the Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's representative at the below-listed telephone numbers to facilitate prosecution of this application.

**Amendment and Response under 37 C.F.R. 1.116**

Applicant: Francisco Corella

Serial No.: 09/483,185

Filed: January 14, 2000

Docket No.: 10991054-1

Title: AUTHORIZATION INFRASTRUCTURE BASED ON PUBLIC KEY CRYPTOGRAPHY

Any inquiry regarding this Response should be directed to either Patrick G. Billig at the below-listed telephone numbers or William P. O'Meara at Telephone No. (970) 898-7917, Facsimile No. (970) 898-7247. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

**Hewlett-Packard Company**

Intellectual Property Administration

P.O. Box 272400

Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

Francisco Corella,

By his attorneys,

**DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC**

Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250

100 South Fifth Street

Minneapolis, MN 55402

Telephone: (612) 573-2003

Facsimile: (612) 573-2005

Date: 1-17-06  
PGB:cmj

  
Patrick G. Billig  
Reg. No. 38,080

**CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8:** The undersigned hereby certifies that this paper or papers, as described herein, are being transmitted via facsimile to Facsimile No. (703) 872-9306 on this 17<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2006.

By:   
Name: **Patrick G. Billig**